

MAY 25 2018

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.

1. USPO Priority Mail Number: 9114 9999 4431 4821 9817 70
2. USPO Priority Mail Number: 9114 9999 4431 4821 9824 18

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re: Taguon Bullett-El, on Behalf of Himself and Mother:
Syteria Hephzibah-El; Affiant, Petitioner.

CORRECTED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Taguon Bullett-El, Unlawful Detainee
Political Prisoner of War for National Liberation from Colonialism
[62013 - 018]

Federal Correctional Complex USP1
P.O. Box 1033
Coleman, Florida [33521-1033]

N/A

Phone Number

In Propria Persona proceeding Sui Juris

AFFIDAVIT FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

1. On the record and for the record, present is Taquan Gullett, also called Maalik Rahshe El; Son, on Behalf of Himself and Mother: Syteria Hephribah, also called Highly Favored Shekinah El, Autochthonous American Moor Alien(friend) Republican Universal Government [AAMARU] Religious Consul Association [*TAQUAN GULLETT ESTATE / SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE - Unified*], hereinafter, "Affiant," Divine Immortal Spirit in Living Flesh and Blood Natural Man / Women of majority, competent by firm sound mind and righteous upright moral integrity, In Propria Persona proceeding in Sui Juris capacity in accord with the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1101 - Alien(s), Alien(Foreign) Estate(s); and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1116(b)(1), (2), (3), (4) - Alien(Foreign) Government, Alien(Foreign) Official(s), Internationally Protected Person(s), Family; irrespective of recognition by the United States [see ^{4th} Judicial Circuit Duval County Florida Probate (Registrar) Court TAQUAN GULLETT ESTATE NOTICE OF TRUST / SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE NOTICE OF TRUST #^{'s} 16-2017-CP-1286/1287; TAQUAN GULLETT ESTATE CAVEAT / SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE CAVEAT #^{'s} 16-2017-CP-1020/1025; TAQUAN GULLETT ESTATE Personal Replevin Claim / SYTERIA LAWRENCE ESTATE Personal Replevin Claim #^{'s} 16-2017-CA-20142/20144].

2. AAMARU Religious Consul Association - Testamentary Trust Situs is located in Molly's Garden Countee, Timucuan, Al Andalusia, Northwest Amexem [Al-Aqsa Al-Maghrib] (Morocco).

3. Affiant does rise and give honors and recognition to the Noble Holy Quran, Holy Koran (7) Circle Seven, Zodiac Constitution AA222141 (Al-Truth), Old Testament, New Testament, Great Law of Peace, Treaty of Peace and Friendship (1787), Madrid Convention for Protection in Morocco (1880), Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)* and all annexes thereto, United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples Adopted by General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960*, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous [Autochthonous] Peoples (2007)*, Geneva Conventions, HABVE EVIDENCE CONVENTIONS, Inter-American Conventions, and all annexes thereto; United States for America Organic Constitution (1787), Statute of the International Court of Justice, and Statute of the International Criminal Court.

4. Affiant does hereby enter an appearance on behalf of Himself and Mother, attending by Special Visitation for corrective action in Equity by this Affidavit for Writ of Mandamus.

In accordance with Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (Fed.R.App.P.) 11(c)(3), Affidavit respectfully requests the Supreme Court to stay the execution of the death sentence of the above-named and aforementioned Clerks against whom relief is sought to forward the parts of the case record "annexed hereto in full by reference" herein in connection with this Affidavit for want of Mandamus to the Supreme Court.

DRDEGS 8670

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS 0
2. PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS - Caption Page 1,2
3. QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW 3
4. RELIEF SOUGHT 3
5. ORDERS BELOW 4
6. LIST OF PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING IN LOWER COURTS 5
7. CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT 5
8. STATUTES AND RULES INVOLVED 5

9. TABLE OF CONTENTS TOC I - TOC I
10. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED TOA I - TOA III

11. JURISDICTION 6
12. STATEMENT OF THE CASE 6
13. I. Clerks' Refusal To Enter Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment of Respondents 6
14. II. Clerks' Refusal To Correct "Case Style Misnomer" 7
15. III. Clerks' unauthorized and unwarranted dismissal of Eleventh Circuit Appeal #'s 18-11031 + 18-11242 7
16. IV. Basis for Federal Jurisdiction of Lower Court Habeas Corpus Actions 8
17. V. Relief Sought By Affiant In The Court of Appeals 8

18. ASSERTION OF MERITS 9
19. I. REASONS FOR ISSUANCE OF THE WRIT 9
 20. A. Mandamus lies to compel performance of ministerial duties prescribed by law 9
 21. II. ADEQUATE RELIEF CANNOT BE OBTAINED FROM ANY OTHER FEDERAL COURT OR IN ANY OTHER FORM 13
 22. III. THE WRIT WILL BE IN AID OF THE SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION 13
 23. IV. EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANT EXERCISE OF THE SUPREME COURT'S DISCRETIONARY POWER 15
 24. V. THERE IS NO PRECISE TIME WITHIN WHICH MANDAMUS MUST BE SOUGHT 19
 25. VI. THE CLERKS' ERRORS SHOULD BE RECTIFIED WITHOUT DELAY 19

26. CONCLUSION 19
27. COMMERCIAL VERIFICATION 21
28. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 22

29. APPENDIX* App. I - App. II

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

1. 9 James Wm. Moore, Bernard J. Ward, Jo Desha Lucas, *Moore's Federal Practice* ¶ 110.30 at 361 (1994 ed.) — 9, 19
2. 16 Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller, Edward H. Cooper & Eugene Grossman, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 3933 at 215 (1977 ed.) — 19
3. Beach Aircraft Corp. v. Rainey, 488 U.S. 153, 174, 109 S.Ct. 439, 102 L.Ed.2d 445 (1988). — 11
4. Black's Law Dictionary 10th Edition — 9, 14
5. Bundy v. Wainwright, 808 F.2d 1410, 1414-16 (11th Cir. 1987) — 10
6. Charles Alan Wright, *Developments in the Law - Federal Habeas Corpus*, Harvard Law Review 1038, 1173-79 (1970) — 10
7. Charles Alan Wright, *Procedure for Habeas Corpus*, 77 F.R.D. 227, 236-40 (1978) — 10
8. Connecticut Nat'l. Mortg. Co. v. Brandstatter, 897 F.2d 883, 884-885 (7th Cir. 1990) — 10
9. Connor v. Coleman, 440 U.S. 612, 624, 99 S.Ct. 1523, 59 L.Ed.2d (1979) — 13
10. Cunningham v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 854 F.2d 914, 916 (6th Cir. 1988) — 11
11. EEOC v. K-Mart Corp., 694 F.2d 1055, 1060 (6th Cir. 1982) — 19
12. Ex parte American Steel Barrel Co., 230 U.S. 35, 45, 33 S.Ct. 1007, 57 L.Ed. 1379 (1913) — 9, 19
13. Ex parte Hung Hwang, 108 U.S. 552, 553, 23 S.Ct. 863, 27 L.Ed. 811 (1883) — 13
14. Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 374, 25 L.Ed. 717 (1879) — 13
15. Fleck v. KDI Sylvan Pools, Inc., 981 F.2d 107, 116 (3d. Cir. 1992) — 11
16. FTC v. Dean Foods Co., 384 U.S. 597, 86 S.Ct. 1738, 16 L.Ed.2d 802, 384 U.S. at 603-604 (1966) — 14
17. Ginett v. Computer Task Group, Inc., 11 F.3d 359, 361 (2d. Cir. 1993) — 11
18. Greenwood v. N.Y. Office of Mental Health, 842 F.2d 636, 638-639 (2nd Cir. 1988) — 9
19. Gulfstream Aerospace Corp. v. Mayacamas Corp., 485 U.S. 271, 289 n.14, 108 S.Ct. 1133, 99 L.Ed.2d 296 (1988) — 14
20. Gullett, Taquan v. Coil, Craig, et al.; U.S.D.C. Northern Florida Tallahassee Division # 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK; Clerk's Case Style Misnomered as "TAQUAN GULLETT v. CRAIG COIL, et al." (2017) — 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 20
21. Gullett, Taquan v. Lockett, Charles L., et al.; U.S.D.C. Middle Florida Ocala Division # 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL; Clerk's Case Style Misnomered as "TAQUAN RIOGENT GULLETT v. WARDEN, FCC COLEMAN-USP1" (2017) — 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 20
22. Hartford Lloyd's Ins. Co. v. Teachworth, 898 F.2d 1058, 1060 (5th Cir. 1990) — 11
23. Hammons, Britt v. Lockett, Charles L., et al.; U.S.D.C. Middle Florida Ocala Division # 5:18-cv-00119-WTH-PRL; Clerk's Case Style Misnomered as "BRITT HAMMONS v. WARDEN, FCC COLEMAN-USP1" (2018) — 17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

46. The State of Mississippi v. Johnson, 71 U.S. (4 Wall) 475, 498, 18 L. Ed. 437 (1866) 12

47. United States v. Braasch, 542 F.2d 442, 444 (7th Cir. 1976) 19

48. United States ex rel. Arent v. Lane, 249 U.S. 367, 249 U.S. 367, 371-372, 39 S.Ct. 293, 63 L.Ed. 650 (1919) 9, 19

49. United States v. Haley, 371 U.S. 18, 19, 83 S.Ct. 11, 9 L.Ed. 2d 1 (1962) 19

50. United States v. Olds, 426 F.2d 562, 565 - 566 (3d Cir. 1970) 19

51. United States v. Pickard, 676 F.3d 1214, 1218 (10th Cir. 2012) 14

52. United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., 310 U.S. 150, 238-239, 60 S.Ct. 811, 84 L.Ed. 1129 (1940) 11

53. United States v. United States District Court, 334 U.S. 258, 263, 68 S.Ct. 1035, 92 L.Ed. 1351 (1948) 14

54. Washington, Danterryo v. Lockett Charles L., et al.; U.S.D.C. Middle Florida Docket Division
#5:18-cv-00002-WTH-PRL; Clerk's Case Style Misnomered as
"DONTERRYO WASHINGTON v. WARDEN, FCC COLEMAN-USP1" (2018) 17, 18

55. Wilbur v. United States, 281 U.S. 206, 218, 50 S.Ct. 320, 74 L.Ed. 809 (1930) 12

56. Wock v. United States, 262 U.S. 200, 208-209, 43 S.Ct. 580, 67 L.Ed. 949 (1923) 12

JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a); 28 U.S.C. § 1651; 28 U.S.C. § 1631; U.S. Constitution Article 1, Section 2, Clause 3; Judiciary Act of 1789; Fed. R. App. P. 21; and Supreme Court Rule 20; to issue an extraordinary writ compelling the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals Clerk, the United States District Court Middle Florida Clerk, and the United States District Court Northern Florida Clerk to: ① enter the Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment of Respondents in Case Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL and Case Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK; ② compel them to correct the erroneous "Clerk's Case Style Misnomer" to reflect the Real Party(ies) in Interest as named in the Caption of the 28 U.S.C. § 2241 Habeas Corpus Affidavits; and ③ compel the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals Clerk to reinstate Appeal Numbers 18-11031 and 18-11042 as of right to enforce entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. Clerk's Refusal To Enter Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment of Respondents

The underlying 28 U.S.C. § 2241 Habeas Corpus Actions Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL was served and commenced in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida Ocala Division on November 2, 2017, and Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK was served and commenced in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida Tallahassee Division on November 15, 2017. A subsequent Addendum Affidavit For Habeas Corpus, Addendum Affidavit for Habeas Corpus-Interrogatories, and 2nd Addendum Modified Affidavit for Habeas Corpus were served and commenced on November 27, 2017, December 18, 2017, and March 15, 2018, in Case Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL. A subsequent Addendum Affidavit for Habeas Corpus and Addendum Affidavit for Habeas Corpus-Interrogatories were served and commenced on December 13, 2017, and December 21, 2017, in Case Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK. Respondents did fail/neglect to timely, adequately, and completely rebut, respond to, answer to, or otherwise defend against the above-mentioned Affidavits for Habeas Corpus, and the applicable time limit [28 U.S.C. § 2243] for Respondents to rebut, respond, answer, or otherwise defend did expire. Affiant did move for entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment on January 12, 2018, and on April 6, 2018, in Case Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL, and on January 16, 2018, in Case Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK. The Clerks have refused to enter the valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment of Respondents.

and unlawful federal removal from State court, and to enforce entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment in the underlying civil actions.

IV. Basis For Federal Jurisdiction Of Lower Court Habeas Corpus Actions

Affiant prosecutes Case Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL on behalf of Himself and Case Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK on behalf of Mother in accord with 28 U.S.C. §2241 as Affiant and Affiant's Mother are currently unlawfully/unconstitutionally detained by color of the authority of the United States; in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States; and/or being official(s) of a foreign [E]state and domiciled therein are unlawfully/unconstitutionally detained for an act done or omitted under any alleged right, title, authority, privilege, protection, or exemption claimed under the commission, order, or sanction of any foreign [E]state, or under color thereof, the validity and effect of which depend upon the law of nations.

V. Relief Sought By Affiant In The Court of Appeals

Affiant's Habeas Corpus Action Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL has Eleventh Circuit Appeal Numbers 18-10360 and 18-11042. Appeal Number 18-10360 was dismissed sua sponte for Lack of Jurisdiction, and Appeal Number 18-11042 was dismissed for Want of Prosecution. Affiant did move for entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment, as well as correction of the Clerk's Case Style Misnomer in the Eleventh Circuit. Affiant's Habeas Corpus Action Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK has Eleventh Circuit Appeal Numbers 18-10060, and 18-10460. Both Appeal Numbers are currently open with motions to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis pending before the Eleventh Circuit. Affiant did move for entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment, as well as correction of Clerk's Case Style Misnomer in the Eleventh Circuit.

Affiant's and Affiant's Mother's Unlawfully Removed State Personal Replevin Actions with an Unlawful federal Injunction ordered have Federal Removal Civil Case Number 3:17-cv-881-J-3QJBT, and Eleventh Circuit Appeal Number 18-11031. Appeal Number 18-11031 was dismissed for Want of Prosecution. There is evidence recorded in the Unlawfully Removed State Personal Replevin Actions of entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment of Respondents, and Affiant was not given any notice nor opportunity to contest the unlawful removal and the unlawful injunction ordered therein while the action was in the District Court.

Following long-established practice under 28 U.S.C. § 2243 and Habeas Corpus Rule 4, it is the responsibility of the Clerk of Court to serve the Habeas Corpus Affidavits upon Respondents [see 28 U.S.C. § 2243; see Bundy v. Wainwright, 808 F.2d 1410, 1414-16 (11th Cir. 1987); see Charles Alan Wright, Developments in the Law - Federal Habeas Corpus, Harvard Law Review 1038, 1173-79 (1970); see Charles Alan Wright, Procedure for Habeas Corpus, 77 F.R.D. 227, 236-40 (1978); see Randy Hertz and James S. Liebman, Federal Habeas Corpus Practice and Procedure, 7th Edition § 11.9(d), Service].

Habeas Corpus Actions 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL and 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK were commenced and Respondents were served upon delivery of the Habeas Corpus Affidavits to the Clerk [see Fed.R.Civ.P. 3, see Fed.R.Civ.P. 5(d)(2)(A); see 28 U.S.C. § 2243; see Habeas Corpus Rule 4; see Prison Mailbox Rule; see Contract Under Seal]. Clerk's failure/neglect to timely docket action does not affect time when action commenced [see Fed.R.Civ.P. 79(a)(1); see Lee v. Superintendent Houtzdale SCI, 798 F.3d 159, 163 (3d Cir. 2015); see Richardson v. Diagnostic Rehab. Ctr., 836 F.Supp. 252, 255 (E.D. Pa. 1993)]. If Respondents have failed to timely object that the action has not been commenced properly, the action may proceed as if a complaint has been filed and a judgment may be entered [see Schlesinger v. Councilmen, 420 U.S. 738, 742 n.5, 95 S.Ct. 1300, 43 L.Ed.2d 591 (1975) — defect in manner action commenced is not jurisdictional and does not prevent entry of valid judgment; NOTE: The Habeas Corpus Actions did properly commence and there is no timely objection by Respondents].

Respondents did fail/neglect to timely, adequately, fully, and completely rebut, respond to, answer to, or otherwise defend against the Habeas Corpus Affidavits and the applicable time limit for Respondents to rebut, respond, answer, or otherwise defend, in accord with 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241, 2242, 2243, 2246 et seq., did expire [see Affidavits for Entry of Default and for Entry of Default Judgment (Cases 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL and 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK (* annexed hereto in full by this reference)]. Affiant moved for entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment in the District Court and in the Eleventh Circuit. Clerks are empowered to make certain orders and issue certain processes including: Entry of Default; Entry of Default Judgment; and Confession of Judgment [see Fed.R.Civ.P. 55(a), (b)(1); see Fed.R.Civ.P. 77(c)(2)(A), (B), (C), (D); see National Leasing Co. v. Williams, 80 F.R.D. 416, 418 (W.D. Pa. 1978)]. Clerks are required to keep a civil docket [see Fed.R.Civ.P. 79(a), (a)(1)]. Respondents' factual valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment are not excused merely if and/or because the Clerk has failed/neglected to record it on the docket [see Connecticut Nat'l. Mortg. Co. v. Brandstatter, 897 F.2d 883, 884-885 (7th Cir. 1990)].

for reinstatement of Appeal Numbers 18-11031, 18-10360, and 18-11242 by Affidavit of Merits as Notice of Appeal To Supreme Court of the United States and for reinstatement of Appeal Numbers 18-11031 and 18-11242 (*both annexed hereto in full by this reference), and Notice of Appeal To Supreme Court of the United States for Appeal Number 18-10360 (*annexed hereto in full by this reference). As of the date of the Certificate of Service for delivery of this Affidavit for Writ of Mandamus, the Clerks' have yet to perform their ministerial duties as prescribed by law and correct the error of unauthorized and unwarranted dismissal by reinstatement of Appeal Numbers 18-11031, 18-10360, and 18-11242. "Due process standards involve minimum contacts and 'traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice'" [see International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310, 316 S.Ct. 154, 90 L.Ed. 95 (1945)].

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 46, 55, 77, 79, in direct terms, declare the Clerks' duties and leaves no doubt that once the requisite conditions and/or procedures have been performed, there is no room for the Clerk to exercise discretion. Rather, the Clerk and the Clerk's staff must do what is required by law — perform the ministerial duties of: entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment; correction of the erroneous "Clerk's Case Style Misnomer;" and reinstate Appeal Numbers 18-11031, 18-10360, and 18-11242.

In cases like those presented in this Affidavit for Writ of Mandamus, when the Clerks have refused to perform their duties, mandamus is the proper remedy. "Mandamus is employed to compel the performance, when refused, of a ministerial duty, this being its chief use [see generally Wilbur v. United States, 281 U.S. 206, 218, 50 S.Ct. 320, 74 L.Ed. 809 (1930); see generally Kozminsky v. Williams, 126 Cal. 26, 58 P. 310, 311 (1899)].

The fact that the Clerks must, in some degree, construe to form a judgment regarding the duty to perform, does not alter the nature of those acts or make them non-ministerial [see generally Work v. United States, 262 U.S. 200, 208-209, 43 S.Ct. 580, 67 L.Ed. 949 (1923)]. Because the Clerks' duties to enter valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment; correct the erroneous case style misnomer; and reinstate Appeal Numbers 18-11031, 18-10360, and 18-11242; are a simple, definite duty arising under conditions that are virtually undisputed and indisputable, mandamus is a proper means of rectifying the errors [see generally The State of Mississippi v. Johnson, 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 475, 498, 18 L.Ed. 437 (1866) — "A ministerial duty, the performance of which may, in proper cases, be required of the head of a department, by judicial process, is one in respect to which nothing is left to discretion. It is a simple, definite duty, arising under conditions admitted or proved to exist, and imposed by law."].

The authority of the appellate court "is not confined to the issuance of writs in aid of jurisdiction already acquired by appeal but extends to those cases which are within its appellate jurisdiction although no appeal has been perfected" [see FTC v. Dean Foods Co., 384 U.S. 597, 86 S.Ct. 1738, 16 L.Ed.2d 802 (1966), 384 U.S. at 603-604 (quoting Roche v. Evaporated Milk Ass'n, 319 U.S. 21, 25, 63 S.Ct. 938, 87 L.Ed.1185 (1943))]. This authority extends to support an ultimate power to review, although not immediately and directly involved [see United States v. United States District Court, 334 U.S. 258, 263, 68 S.Ct. 1035, 92 L.Ed.1351 (1948)].

In most jurisdictions, filing a notice of appeal is the act by which the appeal is perfected [see Black's Law Dictionary 10th Edition]. Affiant filed Notice of Appeal To Supreme Court of the United States for Appeal Number 18-10360 in the Eleventh Circuit on April 19, 2018, and delivered it to Scott Harris, Clerk of the Supreme Court, on or about April 19, 2018. Affiant delivered Affidavit of Merits as Notice of Appeal To Supreme Court of the United States and for Reinstatement of Appeal Numbers 18-11031 and 18-11042 to the Eleventh Circuit Clerk and Supreme Court Clerk on or about April 19, 2018, and April 26, 2018. This act has not only aided, but has perfected the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction in this matter. Furthermore, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) empowers federal courts to issue writs of mandamus that are necessary to protect their prospective jurisdiction.

A mislabeled "appeal" may be treated as a petition for writ of mandamus [see Fed.R.App.P. 21; see In re Repetitive Stress Injury Litig., 35 F.3d 637, 639-640 (Ad. Cir. 1994) - there is no bar to treating appeal as petition for mandamus (citing Gulfstream Aerospace Corp. v. Mayacamas Corp., 485 U.S. 271, 289 n.14, 108 S.Ct. 1133, 99 L.Ed.2d 296 (1988)); see also United States v. Pickard, 676 F.3d 1214, 1218 (10th Cir. 2012) - court indicated that defendants' request to construe notice of appeal as petition for a writ of mandamus would be granted if they had standing and substantially complied with requirements of Fed.R.App.P. 21(a)].

Subject-matter jurisdiction exists if the facts [as stated herein] exist that satisfy one or more of the statutory grounds [i.e. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1651(a), 1651, 2241] for subject-matter jurisdiction over the claims asserted in the complaint [see 28 U.S.C. § 1331 et seq.]. Personal jurisdiction exists over any and all Respondents properly served if it is consistent with due process (i.e. Notice and Opportunity) [see Fed.R.liv.P. 4(c); see International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310, 316, 66 S.Ct. 154, 90 L.Ed. 95 (1945) - due process standards involve minimum contacts and "traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice"].

Added to this is a second consideration that, standing alone, should furnish a substantial ground for issuing a writ of mandamus: more than a likelihood, it is a verified fact that the Clerk's refusal to enter valid Default, Default Judgment, Confession of Judgment; erroneous entry of Clerk's Case Style Misnomer and refusal to correct it after objection; and unwarranted/unauthorized dismissal of Appeals and refusal to reinstate them; are not isolated events, but a representative example of systemic errors that have been made in the past and will continue to be repeated in the future without supervisory intervention and correction. This additional circumstance warranting exercise of the Supreme Court's discretionary power may be seen from Affiant's first-hand personal knowledge verified facts established by the Habeas Corpus Affidavits filed in the directly related cases of this matter in the lower tribunals.

Affiant's Habeas Corpus Affidavits (* annexed hereto in full by this reference) identify and describe and are verified evidence of:

- A Different instances of the Clerk's refusal to enter valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment in multiple courts [see U.S.D.C. Middle Florida Case Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL; see U.S.D.C. Northern Florida Case Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK; see 11th Circuit Appeal Numbers: 18-10060, 18-10360, 18-10460, 18-11242, 18-11031];
- B Different instances of the Clerk's entry of Case Style Misnomer and refusal to correct it after sufficient objection in multiple courts [see U.S.D.C. Middle Florida Case Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL; see U.S.D.C. Northern Florida Case Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK; see 11th Circuit Appeal Numbers: 18-10060, 18-10360, 18-10460, 18-11242, 18-11031];
- C Different instances of the Clerk's unwarranted/unauthorized dismissal of Appeals for want of prosecution based upon an alleged default of not moving to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* in the District Court within the time fixed or prescribed by rule, even though the rule [Fed.R.App.P. 24(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)] is silent on the time period to move in the district court to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* [see 11th Circuit Appeal Numbers 18-11242, 18-10360, and 18-11031]. These different instances were done by two different deputy clerks in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals (i.e. Dionne S. Young and Scott O'Neal).

Yet, it is the standard operating practice and procedure for the Clerks to issue the 14-Day Notice on the same day that the Notice of Appeal is filed and an Appeal Number is issued, and there has been no default pursuant to 11th Cir. R. 42-1(b). At this point, for a confined people moving to appeal IFP, there is no default to trigger the 14-Day Notice. Even more unreasonable and egregious is the fact that the 14-Day Notice is mailed into the institution, so the confined peoples do not even receive the 14-Day Notice until a week or week and a half (7 to 10 days) later at best, but sometimes up to three weeks (21 days) later. This leaves the confined peoples with an unreasonable, insufficient, inadequate, and ineffective time of opportunity to respond, if any time of opportunity at all.

Due to this habitual systemic error as standard operating practice and procedure, the due process rights of many confined peoples are violated and infringed by the unwarranted and unauthorized dismissal of Appeal for want of prosecution pursuant to 11th Cir. R. 42-1(b) [see, 11th Circuit Appeal #18-11042 (Gullett, Taguan v. Lockett, Charles L., et al.; #5:17-cv-00507-WTH-PRL); see 11th Circuit Appeal #18-11031 (Taguan Gullett-El and Sutera Hepzibah-El v. Timothy J. Corrigan, et al.; #3:17-cv-881-J-3QJBT); see 11th Circuit Appeal # 18-10885 (Washington, Dantesayo v. Lockett, Charles L., et al.; #5:18-cv-00002-WTH-PRL)].

Affiant asserts that all of the foregoing does constitute a miscarriage of justice and is evidence which further substantiates Affiant's and Affiant's Mother's factual and lawful claims stated, related, proffered, and preferred in the publicly filed and directly related Affidavits for Habeas Corpus / Affidavits of Probable Cause / Affidavits of Information / Letters Rogatory / Criminal Complaints; that Respondents and Court Personnel in active concert and/or participation are engaged in a pattern and/or practice of Denial of Justice, Denial of Equality Before the Law, Abuse of Discretion, Arbitrary and Capricious Decisions / Actions, Discrimination and/or Deprivation and/or Conspiracy to Deprive and/or Resistance to the full enjoyment of peoples' constitutionally protected and/or secured Natural Rights, Human Rights, and/or Civil Rights, privileges, and/or immunities [see 18 U.S.C. Chapter 7 § 112; see 42 U.S.C. § 1987; see 42 U.S.C. §§ 1997(c), 2000].

Affiant and Affiant's Mother further respectfully invite the Supreme Court to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to entry of valid Default, Default Judgment, and Confession of Judgment, to affect our immediate discharge from unlawful/unconstitutional detainment and false imprisonment on our above-mentioned Personal Relevein Bonds or on Recognizance Bond pending appeal and certiorari in this matter. Everyday of unlawful/unconstitutional detainment and false imprisonment is further irreparable injury, and Affiant and Affiant's Mother are entitled to redress and compensation by law.

Affiant and Affiant's Mother further respectfully invite the assistance of the Supreme Court, in the nature of an Ex Rel. Action / Humanitarian Intervention / Amicus Curiae, for such equitable relief as may be appropriate to insure the minimum corrective measures necessary in this matter and the directly related Habeas Corpus Actions / Civil Action #5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL (11th Cir. Appeal Numbers 18-10360, 18-11040), #4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK (11th Cir. Appeal Numbers 18-10060, 18-10460), and #3:17-cv-881-J-32JBT (11th Cir. Appeal Number 18-11031).

Also, in accord with the Human Rights enumerated and guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and all annexes thereto, United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (1960), and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous [Autochthonous] Peoples (2007), Affiant and Affiant's Mother respectfully invite access to and prompt decision through just and fair procedures, as well as to effective remedies for all infringements, for the honorable resolution of Affiant's and Affiant's Mother's above-mentioned Habeas Corpus Actions / Civil Action and Cause proffered, preferred, stated, and related herein.

Finally, Affiant and Affiant's Mother respectfully invite all such other relief, intermediate relief, and further relief, in accord with Natural Equity, for the honorable resolution of the above-mentioned Habeas Corpus Actions / Civil Action and Cause herein proffered, preferred, stated and related to the Supreme Court, as law and justice require.

In Honor.

Certificate of Service

I, Taguen Gullett, also called Maalik Rahshe El; Son, On Behalf of Himself and Mother: Syteria Nephzibah, also called Highly favored Shekinah El, Autochthonous American Moor Alien (friend) Republican Universal Government [AAMARU] Religious Consul Association, competent Natural Man/Women of majority, do certify, declare, and affirm that on or about the Tenth day of the Fifth month in the year of Our Lord Allah fourteen Hundred Thirty Eight (1438) [G.C.Y. 2018-May, 10], as required by Supreme Court Rule 29, I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS and Affidavit for Writ of Mandamus on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them with first-class postage pre-paid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

Scott Harris, Clerk of Court; Supreme Court of the United States

1 First Street, NE, Washington, District of Columbia 20543

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

1. Smith, David J.; 2. Young, Dionne J.; 3. O'Neal, Scott:

Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals; 56 Forsyth Street, NW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303

4. Warren, Elizabeth M.; 5. Hodges, Wm. Terrell; 6. Lammers, Philip R.:

U.S.D.C. Middle Florida Ocala Division; 207 Northwest Second Street, Suite 337, Ocala, Florida 34475-6603

7. Lublanovitz, Jessica J.; 8. Stafford, William; 9. Kahn, Jr., Charles J.:

U.S.D.C. Northern Florida Tallahassee Division; 111 North Adams Street, 3rd floor, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

10. Lockett, Charles L.; 11. Cheatham, R.C.; 12. Miller, G.; 13. Reiser, Steven; 14. Sena, E.:

15. Dunn, Geoffrey; 16. Kleckner, M.:

845 N.E. 54th Terrace, Coleman, Florida 33521-1029

17. Coil, Craig; 18. Campbell, Joetta:

501 Capital Circle, NE, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-3558

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL / NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT
APPLICABLE TO ALL SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS
CORRECTED Certificate of Service

I, Taquan Gullett, also called Maalik Rahshe El; Son, On Behalf of Himself and Mother: Syteria Hephzibah, also called Highly Favored Shekinah El, Autochthonous American Moor Alien (friend) Republican Universal Government [AAMARU] Religious Consul Association Testamentary Trust, competent Natural Men/Woman of majority, do certify, declare, and affirm that on or about the Thirteenth day of Dhu Hijjah in the year of Our Lord Allah fourteen Hundred Thirty Nine (1439) [G.C.Y. 2018 - August, 24], as required by Supreme Court Rule 29, I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS and Affidavit for Writ of Mandamus w/ Judgments and Orders Appended Thereto on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them with first-class postage pre-paid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days. The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

0. Scott S. Harris, Clerk of Court, Supreme Court of the United States:
1 First Street, NE, Washington, District of Columbia 20543

1. Smith, David J.; 2. Young, Dianne S.; 3. O'Neal, Scott:
Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals; 56 Forsyth Street, NW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303

4. Warren, Elizabeth; 5. Nodges, Wm. Terrell; 6. Lammens, Philip R.:
U.S.D.L. Middle Florida Ocala Division; 207 Northwest Second Street, Suite 337, Ocala, Florida 34475-6603

7. Lyubljanovitz, Jessica J.; 8. Stafford, William; 9. Kahn, Jr., Charles J.:
U.S.D.L. Northern Florida Tallahassee Division, 111 North Adams Street, 3rd Floor, Tallahassee, Florida 32301

10. Lockett, Charles L.; 11. Cheatham, R.L.; Miller, G.; 13. Reiser, Steven; 14. Sena, E.; 15. Dunn, Geoffrey;
16. Kleckner, M.; 845 N.E. 54th Terrace, Coleman, Florida 33521-1029

17. Coil, Craig; 18. Campbell, Joetta: 501 Capital Circle, NE, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-3558

APPENDIX *

In accord with Fed. R. App. P. 11(a)*, Affiant respectfully requests the Supreme Court to demand the Clerks against whom relief is sought to forward the following parts of the case records, which are annexed and appended hereto in full by this reference:

1. Affidavits for Entry of Default and for Entry of Default Judgment (dated January 12, January 16, January 29, and April 6, 2018): Case Numbers 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL, #4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK; Eleventh Circuit Appeal Numbers 18-10060, 18-10360, 18-10460, 18-11242; Pg. 4, 10
2. Notices of Appeal (dated December 21, 2017; January 29, February 13, and March 26, 2018): District Court Case Numbers 5:17-cv-00527-WTN-PRL, #4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK; Eleventh Circuit Appeal Numbers 18-10060, 18-10360, 18-10460, 18-11242; Pg. 4
3. Order of Dismissal for Lack of Jurisdiction (dated March 7, 2018): District Court Case Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL; Pg. 4
4. Order of Dismissal for Lack of Jurisdiction (dated April 14, 2018): Eleventh Circuit Appeal Number 18-10360; Pg. 4
5. Order of Dismissal for Want of Prosecution (dated April 11, and April 17, 2018): Eleventh Circuit Appeal Numbers 18-11242, 18-11031; Pg. 4
6. Order of Dismissal for Lack of Jurisdiction (dated January 2, 2018): District Court Case Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK; Pg. 4
7. Referral and Order of Dismissal for Lack of Jurisdiction (dated January 22, 2018): District Court Case Number 4:17-cv-00532-WS-CJK; Pg. 4
8. Affidavit of Merits as 2nd Notice of Interlocutory Appeal & Objection To 9th Day of January 2018 Order and as Objection To Clerk's Case Style Misnomer (dated February 5, 2018): District Court Case Number 5:17-cv-00527-WTH-PRL; Pg. 4, 7